

Application Number: 10/736,100

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Response to "Response to Arguments" from the final office action

The Examiner's Response to Arguments in the final office action from 12th October and the subsequent telephone conversation with the Examiner and his supervisor on 13th December, 2010 highlighted a misinterpretation of the current application, in that the term "respondent" was not considered to be referring to a human by the Examiner in the application. In fact the dictionary definition of the term "respondent" is "a *person* who responds or makes reply" (www.dictionary.com) thereby nullifying any arguments which refer to a non-human – as in the case of Olson's application which is cited throughout the rejection.

In addition the Examiner misinterprets the word "survey" as used in the current application, stating that the term "survey" means "to examine as to condition, situation, or value". This is in fact the incorrect definition of the term "survey" as used in the current application. The term "survey" as used in the current application is qualified by the term "questionnaire" (ie "questionnaire survey") In this instance, the term "survey" as used in the current application is defined as: "a sampling, or partial collection, of facts, figures, or opinions taken and used to approximate or indicate what a complete collection and analysis might reveal" (www.dictionary.com). As such the term "survey" as in "questionnaire survey" can not apply to Olson's application.

In addition the Examiner misinterprets the word "rational" stating throughout his arguments